

**HERITAGE DEVELOPMENT BOARD
OF
THE CITY OF SAINT JOHN**

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 7, 2017

The meeting of the Heritage Development Board was held in the 10th Floor Boardroom of City Hall, commencing at 5:30 pm.

IN ATTENDANCE:

Bob Boyce, Chair
Shane Goguen, 1st Vice Chair
Elizabeth McGahan, 2nd Vice Chair
Councillor Blake Armstrong
Patrick McCaffrey
Bob McVicar
Scott Rinehart
Melissa Wakefield
Councillor Blake Armstrong

Amy Poffenroth, Deputy Commissioner
Alice Fudge, Heritage Officer
Taylor McIntyre, Recording Secretary

ITEM 1.0 AGENDA

MOVED by Elizabeth McGahan, *SECONDED* by Patrick McCaffrey to approve the agenda for the meeting of June 7, 2017 with addition of Item 7.1, Public Hearing in June 12 and Item 7.2, Saint John Built Heritage Group.

CARRIED.

ITEM 2.0 MINUTES

MOVED by Shane Goguen, *SECONDED* by Melissa Wakefield to approve the minutes for the meeting of May 3, 2017.

CARRIED.

ITEM 3.0 BUSINESS ARISING

ITEM 3.1 LETTER TO HDB FROM GREG PATERSON, KING STREET EAST, MAY 9, 2017

The Board discussed the light lamp poles on King Street East and other similar fixtures in the area.

MOVED by Melissa Wakefield, *SECONDED* by Scott Rinehart to refer the suggestion to the Neighbourhood Action Plan.

ITEM 4.0 INTRODUCTION OF APPLICANTS/GUESTS

Applicants and guests in attendance were Peter Smit of 1260 Manawagonish Road, John Desmond of 92-96 Princess Street and Kennedy Coleman-Eustace of 79 Duke Street.

ITEM 5.0 APPLICATIONS CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS

ITEM 5.1A APPLICATION FOR A HERITAGE PERMIT # 2017-0512
PETER SMIT, 1260 MANAWAGONISH ROAD

Alice gives the Board an overview of the history of the property, commonly known as the Quinton Farmhouse and the application. The homeowner, Peter Smit is requesting approval to remove the front porch from the building to allow him to restore/recreate the original Georgian-style entrance. Alice provided an overview of Georgian-style architecture including photos of similar entrance ways to what is assumed the farmhouse original had.

The farmhouse was built between 1815 and 1825; there is no specific date as there are no photos from that time. It is presumed that the porch is not original to the building; however, it was added very early in the life of the farmhouse, as seen in photos dated 1880.

This request is considered a restoration project. Mr. Smit has been restoring this house to its original style for the past 27 years.

The Standards for Preservation, Rehabilitation and Restoration apply to this proposal from the *Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada*. The guiding principle for this proposal comes from Standard 2, "Conserve changes to an historic place that, over time, have become character-defining elements in their own right."

The front porch would be considered a character defining element, even though it was not part of the original structure, it has been there for the majority of the building's life.

Alice states that it is important to conserve these changes and elevations that were made over time. Alice recommends denial of removal and suggests the porch be repaired and restored.

Mr. Smit gave the Board a detailed history of the Quinton Farmhouse and the Quinton family's significance to the area. The house was one of the first buildings in current West Saint John. Mr. Smit also gave a history on how he obtained the house and the extensive restoration he has done on the house. He shared two photo albums with before and after photos of his work to the interior and exterior of the house.

Mr. Smit researched Georgian-style entrances by looking around Saint John and used other houses of the same era as inspiration of the proposed design. There are few buildings in Saint John that have the original 1820-1830 entrance ways. Mr. Smit shared some photos of the buildings to attendees to get an idea of his proposed design.

Mr. Smit argued that if his work to remove the metal roof from 1890 and restore the cedar shingle roof was approved, why can't this application be approved?

Mr. Smit is very passionate about his home and wants to restore the building to its original style in its entirety.

The Chairman asked if there is a foundation under the porch. Mr. Smit replied that there is very little and explains his theory on why it is sloped slightly. He wants to do the job right and will hire the right person for the job.

The Chairman clarified that if the porch was to be removed, the only new creation would be the surrounds/frame around the door and the original door would remain.

Bob McVicar mentioned that this is the first time he can remember that the Board is discouraging someone from restoring their property to its original style. He understands Alice's point of view and using the Board's guiding principle, the National Standards, but he states he is confused why the Board cannot support the proposal because the porch is not original and the applicant's desire is to restore it to the original. He doesn't believe the recommendation is consistent with other applications and approvals they've had in the past regarding similar circumstances. He is inclined to approve the work. He says he has always noticed the porch being out of character for the style of the home.

Scott Rinehart asks if Mr. Smit knew if the elements of the original frame were used in the construction of the porch. Mr. Smit said no because it was redone with plywood and other materials not of that time.

Scott says he understands Alice's thinking but that if he was in Mr. Smit's situation, he would take the opportunity to do the proposed work. He says it's about authenticity. Scott says that Mr. Smit isn't just looking to remove the porch; he is looking to restore the original entrance. He asks the question: Is the porch out of place? He believes it is. The Board has previously allowed the removal of the metal roof that was added in 1880 in order to restore back to the original cedar shingles. He would have no problem supporting the removal. Scott recommended Mr. Smit consult with people who are familiar with this type of restoration for design elements.

The Chairman states that it is clear that Mr. Smit has been engaged in restoration projects with the Quinton Farmhouse and he has given thorough documentation (seen in the photo albums provided by the applicant). He would be okay with removal of the porch due to the documentation. He says this project would be an example for future generations to show commitment to restoration in the Saint John area. He hopes that Mr. Smit would have the same commitment to the documentation of this restoration.

Patrick McCaffrey provided insight that maybe the porch was added because of the severe winter weather Saint John experiences, compared to southern United States where this style of home is prominent.

Shane said he would be supportive of the proposal only because the rationale behind the proposal is restoration.

Alice says documentation will likely be included in the restoration, which Mr. Smit has already done for all other projects he has done with this house.

Mr. Smit says the house is historically designated; he was the one who requested it to ensure the history of the house and area is preserved.

The Chairman encourages Mr. Smit apply for provincial designation and Alice suggests looking into placing the property of the national history registry.

Councillor Blake Armstrong admires Mr. Smit's passion and commended him for his commitment to the house. He believes Mr. Smit will do a great job on the restoration.

Elizabeth confirmed with Mr. Smit that the house is a pre-loyalist building.

The Chairman thanks Mr. Smit for his commitment to the restoration of the Quinton Farmhouse.

ITEM 5.1B APPLICATION FOR A HERITAGE PERMIT # 2017-0512
PETER SMIT, 1260 MANAWAGONISH ROAD

MOVED by Bob McVicar *SECONDED* by Scott Rinehart to approve:

"A Heritage Permit to remove the front porch from the building to enable the restoration of the original Georgian-style entrance (circa 1815)."

CARRIED.

Peter Smit leaves the meeting at 6:20pm.

ITEM 5.3A APPLICATION FOR A HERITAGE PERMIT # 2017-0514
KENNEDY COLEMAN-EUSTACE, 79 DUKE STREET

Alice gives the Board an overview of the house at 79 Duke Street. The 1926 house was heavily damaged by a structure fire on March 13, 2017. Debris and firefighting caused damage to front windows and the interior of the building.

The proposed work includes the replacement of the damaged front windows (non-original wood window inserts) plus the replacements of the side and rear windows (original wood windows) both with black vinyl windows to match the size and configuration of the existing. Alice would also like the Board to consider another window option – aluminium clad vinyl. The rear bottom floor windows have the original wood sliding windows and the top two levels are 1980s wood replacement painted wood inserts. Majority of the windows are damaged: they do not open, are not air tight, glazing needs to be replaced, mould on sills, etc.

Alice recommends repair of windows and protecting with storm window. Property owner is not interested in this option because it is expensive due to the large amount of windows. The proposal is to replace windows with black painted vinyl or black aluminium clad vinyl. The Board typically does not approve vinyl windows. There is opportunity to discuss this type of window for to the windows on rear and side of building.

Mr. Coleman-Eustace says he bought the building two years ago and has done a lot of work since the purchase including Minimum Standard compliances, roof repair and basement renovation. The house was functional but the windows have always been an idea to upgrade. After research, it proved to be difficult to find someone to repair the windows and the difficulty of the repair process. The cost wasn't feasible to him. He wants to improve the windows for tenants for comfort reasons because snow blows in through closed windows. He is looking for an affordable option. He says the surrounding area has white vinyl windows and is wondering if there can be a compromise.

Councillor Armstrong asked if the Board has any wiggle room of side or back windows to replace with vinyl windows as they aren't seen as much compared to the front façade of the house.

Melissa asked the applicant if fibre glass windows have been considered. Mr. Coleman-Eustace says yes but still very expensive, however, less than repair the wood windows. The Chairman mentioned that previous applications have been denied for fibre glass due to the lower portion looked too modern. Aluminium clad has been approved because it looked practically identical to a painted wooden window.

Mr. Coleman-Eustace says two windows were broken from the fire but many others were damaged from the water during firefighting. There is \$100,000 in renovations due to fire.

Bob McVicar asked if the applicant will get money from the insurance claim for the windows. Mr. Coleman-Eustace replied that with his insurance details and the age of the windows he won't get much money. All of the work inside the house should be covered by insurance.

Bob McVicar says that the Board tries to show flexibility and be reasonable but are adamant about maintaining the appearance of historical buildings. Blake mentioned that all you see is the front of the building. Bob replied that the Board hasn't consistently distinguished the front from rear in regards to specifications.

Bob McVicar propped recommended to motion to have the property owner continue to work with Alice and come back to the Board with a new plan. Alice mentioned that she and the property owner have been in discussion about this proposal since March.

Mr. Coleman-Eustace asked if the Board would be open to having wood windows in front and vinyl windows on sides and rear. Alice says she has considered similar options with Mr. Coleman-Eustace. She would recommend aluminium clad wood on front and aluminium clad vinyl on sides and rear.

Patrick prompts a discussion about the appearance differences between aluminium clad wood and aluminium clad vinyl windows.

ITEM 5.3B APPLICATION FOR A HERITAGE PERMIT # 2017-0514
KENNEDY COLEMAN-EUSTACE, 79 DUKE STREET

MOVED by Councillor Blake Armstrong *SECONDED* by Bob McVicar to deny:

"A Heritage Permit for the replacement of 41 windows with black vertical sliding vinyl windows."

CARRIED.

After motion carried, Mr. Coleman-Eustace asked the Board if they have any suggestions for repairmen. Bob McVicar said he will contact Mr. Coleman-Eustace with a recommended contractor.

Shane also mentioned that if Mr. Coleman-Eustace were to repair the current windows, it would be considered for a grant as it is a restoration project.

Mr. Coleman-Eustace prompted a discussion about storm windows.

Shane asked, disregarding the Admiral Beatty application, if the Board has considered this type of situation in the past. The Chairman said it was approved once as the wall was very difficult to see from the street but the property owner decided to repoint instead of installing metal cladding.

Attendees discussed the National Building Code's references to cladding and stucco. They also discuss that stucco is non-reversible.

The Chairman suggests tabling the application to allow for more research and to come back with more options.

Elizabeth asks for clarification if the applicant were to repoint and repair the brick, would he then be able to install metal cladding. Alice says that if the brick would be repaired, the metal cladding wouldn't be necessary. The reason the applicant is applying for metal cladding is because the cost of repairing and repointing brick is expensive.

Mr. Desmond says it's all in the interest of money. He would love to repair and repoint the brick but it comes at a large expense. Elizabeth asks about pricing. Mr. Desmond replied it would be tens of thousands of dollars more to repair and repoint brick. He would rather spend that money on a wheelchair ramp and other renovations to the storefront.

ITEM 5.2B APPLICATION FOR A HERITAGE PERMIT # 2017-0513
JOHN DESMOND, 92-96 PRINCESS STREET

MOVED by Shane Goguen SECONDED by Councillor Blake Armstrong to move:

"A discussion of possible options to repair or cover east-facing wall of building."

CARRIED.

Mr. Desmond leaves at 7:20pm.

ITEM 6.0 REPORTS

Item 6.1 MONTHLY HERITAGE PERMITS BY STAFF

Alice told the Board that we are still in the early stages of pulling information from the tracking system so it is difficult to quantify the results at this stage. However, she says that she is enjoying the new system so far. There has been a lot of change with the new system so it still taking some time to get accustomed to it.

Alice provided members with an overview of the Heritage Permits she has approved since the last Board meeting.

Alice asked the Board if they would prefer her to explain the projects or provide them with a list of approved permits. Shane says a list would suffice.

Shane asks about the grant program and Alice replied that there have been a few applications but it is still early.

ITEM 7.0 OTHER BUSINESS

Item 7.1 PUBLIC HEARING – JUNE 12

The Chairman shared that there will be a public hearing for the removal of 3 PIDs from the King Street East Heritage Conservation Area proposed Irving Oil Limited's Head Office Parking Structure on Monday at the scheduled Common Council meeting.

Shane asked if anyone has heard any negative comments about the proposed parking structure since the Telegraph-Journal released an article about the structure. Board members said that they haven't heard any negative comments regarding Irving Oil's plan or design.

Item 7.3 WATCH US GROW MAPPING TOOL

Amy Poffenroth shared Growth and Community Development Services new mapping tool that was released to the public on June 6th at the Growth Committee meeting. The new tool allows the public to view if a specific property has been issued or has applied for a permit, whether it is a building, heritage, plumbing, development or demolition permit.

Councillor Blake Armstrong said the tool is fantastic.

**Item 7.2 SAINT JOHN BUILT HERITAGE GROUP
JUNE 8, 2017 - TRINITY CHURCH, 7PM**

The Chairman shares that interested citizens are hosting a public meeting for a Saint John Heritage Group. This group has stemmed from the demolition of the JellyBean housings on Wellington Row.

There was a brief discussion about the light poles on King Street East and the telephone wires in that area. There was also a discussion about the heritage recognition street signs in select areas in the City and the possibility of having those signs places along King Street East. Councillor Blake Armstrong said he would look into the possibility.

Item 7.4 STAFFING CHANGES

Alice let the Board know that she will be leaving her position as Heritage Officer with the City of Saint John in August to pursue further education. She will be taking her Masters of Architecture and Heritage Conservation at Carleton University's Azrieli School of Architecture.

Amy Poffenroth said that a job posting for Alice's position will be posted in the coming week.

Members are saddened by Alice's departure but are excited for her new adventure and her continuing education.

ITEM 8.0 NEXT MEETING

The next regular Board meeting will be held Wednesday, July 5, 2017.

ITEM 9.0 ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 7:40 pm.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Alice Fudge". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial 'A' and 'F'.

Alice Fudge
Heritage Officer,
Growth & Community Development Services